

Application No.: 10/826,530
Docket No.: HT4020USNA

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of subject claims 1-14 are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 USC 102/103

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by or in the alternative under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over US Patent Application Publication 2002/0142689 to Levit (Levit) or US 5833807 to Ramachandran et al. (Ramachandran).

Applicant notes that this rejection does not cite US 5948543 to Ootuka et al (Ootuka) or US 6566288 to Kurumatani et al (Kurumatani) and assumes that the rejection as to these references has been withdrawn.

In response to the argument previously presented, the Examiner states that although Levit teaches only floc, at paragraph 005 it cites US4698267 to Tokarsky as disclosing p-aramid pulp in combination with para/meta-aramid floc. However, as disclosed at column 2, lines 6-27, Tokarsky does not teach meta-aramid floc, only meta-aramid fibrils. The Examiner further argues that Tokarsky teaches floc having modulus in the range of 203 cN/tex to 8400 cN/tex, which would cover the claimed limitation of less than 3000 cN/tex. The Examiner has misread Tokarsky, because at column 2, lines 59-68, the properties of the floc are tensile strength of about 203 cN/tex and tensile modulus of about 8400 cN/tex, not the range as of modulus as the Examiner had indicated. Moreover, even the low-modulus floc as disclosed at column 3, lines 1-2 has a modulus of about 4860 cN/tex. These modulus values are much higher than the claimed range for the floc, which is below 3000 cN/tex.

The Examiner admits that Ramachandran does not explicitly disclose the ratio of fibers, but then argues that at column 4, lines 3-10, the reference teaches 5-95% of aramid fibers, which includes at least one of aramid fibers or aramid floc. The Examiner further suggests that the discovery of an optimum value of a result effective variable is ordinarily within the skill of the

Application No.: 10/826,530
Docket No.: HT4020USNA

art. However, this position is not tenable because Ramachandran not only does not disclose the ratio of fibers, it does not even disclose or suggest a combination of paramid pulp with floc having a modulus below 3000 cN/tex.

None of the references individually teach every limitation of the claims. No combination of the references discloses or suggests every limitation of the subject claims. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection as to both anticipation and obviousness is improper and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the foregoing is a complete response to the subject Office Action. Applicants believe that all rejections have been overcome and that the instant claims are now in condition for allowance. If any matters remain for resolution, please contact the undersigned.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Frederick D. Strickland
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 39,041

Dated: 3/7/2008